

USSN 09/500,698  
Page 10 of 15

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 07 2007

**REMARKS**

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action mailed December 7, 2006. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-35, 39, 41-48, and 50 are pending and rejected. Applicant traverses all of the rejections in the Office Action and respectfully requests reconsideration and passage of the claims to allowance for the following reasons. The Applicants herein amend claims 1, 22, 31, 39, 48 and 50.

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following discussion, Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

It is to be understood that Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the prior art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant response including amendments.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the following remarks.

***Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-13, 15-17, 19-32, 39, 41, 43-48 and 50 Patentable over Sridhar/Hyakutake under §103***

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 7-13, 15-17, 19-32, 39, 41, 43-48 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,324,582 to Sridhar et al. (hereinafter "Sridhar") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,788,709 to Hyakutake (hereinafter "Hyakutake").

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. As discussed in Applicant's response to the Office Action mailed July 24, 2006, the Sridhar reference fails to teach all of the claim limitations.

529013-1

USSN 09/500,698

Page 11 of 15

Specifically, the Sridhar arrangement fails to disclose or suggest the invention of claim 1, as follows:

1. A method for receiving data via multiple channel broadcast media, comprising:
  - receiving a request for a desired data object, said desired data object being associated with a first-level name;
  - obtaining a plurality of second-level names associated with said first-level name, each second-level names being associated with one of a plurality of low-level data objects, said low-level data objects being in order by retrieval priority; and
  - obtaining location information associated with said second-level names via a first broadcast channel, said location information identifying at least two of multiple broadcast channels for carrying data associated with said low-level data objects;wherein said desired data object is a web page comprising at least a portion of said low-level data objects for retrieval and display in order defined by said retrieval priority.

In contrast to the above-quoted claim language, the Sridhar arrangement fails to disclose or suggest at least the step of "said low-level data objects being in order by retrieval priority, wherein said retrieval priority is set by a content provider" or "wherein said desired data object is a web page comprising at least a portion of said low-level data objects for retrieval and display in order defined by said retrieval priority", as positively claimed by Applicant's independent claim 1. The Examiner concedes this in the Office Action. (See Office Action, p. 3, ll. 17-22.) However, the Examiner alleges that Hyakutake bridges the substantial gap left by Sridhar.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Hyakutake fails to bridge the substantial gap between Sridhar and Applicant's claimed invention of at least claim 1 because Hyakutake only teaches retrieving and displaying icons in order of timing information. (See Hyakutake, col. 1, l. 57 – col. 2, l. 34; col. 10, ll. 10-65; col. 17, ll. 26-39; col. 20 ll. 30-34.)

Nowhere in Hyakutake is there any teaching or suggestion of at least Applicant's claimed step of "said low-level data objects being in order by retrieval priority, wherein said retrieval priority is set by a content provider". In an exemplary embodiment, the retrieval priority is set at the discretion of the content provider.

USSN 09/500,698

Page 12 of 15

(See Applicant's specification, p. 16, ll. 1-9.) For example, the retrieval priority may be according to spatial properties (e.g. center icons, then outer icons), type of icons (e.g. banner advertisements before other icons) or priority class values (e.g. A, B, C and D.) (See Applicant's specification, p. 16, l. 1 – p. 17, l. 11.) As such, Sridhar and Hyakutake alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations of amended claim 1.

Amended independent claims 22, 31, 39, 48 and 50 recite relevant limitations similar to those recited in independent claim 1 and, as such, for at least the reasons discussed above, the Sridhar and Hyakutake references alone or in combination also fail to disclose or suggest all the claim limitations of claims 22, 31, 39, 48 and 50. Since dependent claims 3, 4, 7-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23-30, 32, 41, and 43-47 depend from claims 1, 22, 31 and 39 and recite additional limitations therefrom, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

As such, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3, 4, 7-13, 15-17, 19-32, 39, 41, 43-48 and 50 are patentable over Sridhar and Hyakutake under 35 U.S.C. §103. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Claim 14 Patentable over Sridhar/Hyakutake/Zigmond under §103***

The Office Action rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view Hyakutake in further view of U.S. Patent 6,785,902 to Zigmond et al. (hereinafter "Zigmond").

This ground of rejection applies only to a dependent claim, and it is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 given Sridhar in view of Hyakutake. Since the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 given Sridhar in view of Hyakutake has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that Zigmond supplies that which is missing from Sridhar in view of Hyakutake to render the independent claims obvious, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained.. As such, Applicant submits that claim 14 is patentable over Sridhar in view of Hyakutake in further view of Zigmond under 35

529013-1

USSN 09/500,698  
Page 13 of 15

U.S.C. §103. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Claims 18, 33 and 34 Patentable over Sridhar/Hyakutake/Altschuler under §103***

The Office Action rejected claims 18, 33 and 34 as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view of Hyakutake in further view of U.S. Patent 6,778,971 to Altschuler et al. (hereinafter "Altschuler").

This ground of rejection applies only to a dependent claim, and it is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 given Sridhar in view of Hyakutake. Since the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 given Sridhar in view of Altschuler has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that Altschuler supplies that which is missing from Sridhar in view of Hyakutake to render the independent claims obvious, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained.. As such, Applicant submits that claims 18, 33 and 34 are patentable over Sridhar in view of Hyakutake in further view of Altschuler under 35 U.S.C. §103. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Claim 6 Patentable over Sridhar/Hyakutake/Ikeda under §103***

The Office Action rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view of Hyakutake in further view of U.S. Patent 6,212,681 to Ikeda (hereinafter "Ikeda").

This ground of rejection applies only to a dependent claim, and it is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 given Sridhar in view of Hyakutake. Since the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 given Sridhar in view of Hyakutake has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that Ikeda supplies that which is missing from Sridhar in view of Hyakutake to render the independent claims obvious, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained.. As such, Applicant submits that claim 6 is patentable over Sridhar in view of Hyakutake in further view of Ikeda under 35

529013-1

USSN 09/500,698  
Page 14 of 15

U.S.C. §103. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Claim 35 Patentable over Sridhar/Hyakutake/Boon under §103***

The Office Action rejected claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view of Hyakutake in further view of U.S. Patent 6,351,565 to Boon (hereinafter "Boon").

This ground of rejection applies only to a dependent claim, and it is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 given Sridhar in view of Hyakutake. Since the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 given Sridhar in view of Hyakutake has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that Boon supplies that which is missing from Sridhar in view of Hyakutake to render the independent claims obvious, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained. As such, Applicant submits that claim 35 is patentable over Sridhar in view of Hyakutake in further view of Boon under 35 U.S.C. §103. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Claim 42 Patentable over Sridhar/Hyakutake/Bisdikian under §103***

The Office Action rejected claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view of Hyakutake in further view of U.S. Patent 6,047,317 to Bisdikian et al. (hereinafter "Bisdikian").

This ground of rejection applies only to a dependent claim, and it is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 given Sridhar in view of Hyakutake. Since the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 given Sridhar in view of Hyakutake has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that Bisdikian supplies that which is missing from Sridhar in view of Hyakutake to render the independent claims obvious, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained. As such, Applicant submits that claim 42 is patentable over Sridhar in view of Hyakutake in further view of Bisdikian under 35

USSN 09/500,698  
Page 15 of 15

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 07 2007

U.S.C. §103. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage of the claims to allowance. If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall or Jimmy Kim at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

3/7/07

E J Wall

Eamon J. Wall, Attorney  
Reg. No. 39,414  
(732) 530-9404

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP  
Attorneys at Law  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702